

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 4, 13 and 20 have been canceled and claims 1 and 10 have been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as unpatentable over Duruoz et al. in view of Morel and Acharya, which is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter recited in dependent claim 4. Independent claims 10 and 19 have been amended in a similar manner. For example, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that the step (b) converts the encoding type of said macro block so that the encoding type of said macro block coincides with the encoding type of said original source image, if the checked two encoding types are different.

These features are supported at least by Figures 10 and 11 and the corresponding description in the specification. For example, Figure 10 illustrates converting the encoding type of the field type macro block to be a frame type macro block so that the encoding type of the macro block coincides with the encoding type of the original source image (the frame type in Figure 10). Figure 11 illustrates the opposite procedure.

Regarding the subject matter recited in dependent claim 4, the Office Action relies on Morel as teaching converting an encoding type of the macro block so that the encoding type of the macro block coincides with the encoding type of the original source image and cites col. 2, line 53-col. 3, line 7. However, it is respectfully noted this section merely indicates that a field-frame conversion process occurs including the conversion from the field format into the frame format and the conversion from the frame format into the field format. It is respectfully submitted there is no description in Morel about converting an encoding type of a macro block to coincide with an encoding type of an original source image. Rather, Morel merely teaches converting a field format into a frame format and vice versa.

That is, even though the encoding type of the macro block becomes identical to that of the other input and output macro blocks, the related art problems discussed in Figures 4 and 5 of

the present application still occur. That is, even though the macro blocks become identical to each other in their encoding types, if the image of the macro block is resized in a state in which the encoding type of the macro block is different from that of an original source image, the related art problems appearing in Figures 4 and 5 of the present application occur.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 10 and 19 and the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact David A. Bilodeau, Reg. No. 42,325, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: **MAR - 5 2007**

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther Chong
Esther H. Chong
Registration No.: 40,953
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant